PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

REC'D 2 1 MAR 2006

WIPO PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference	EOD EIDTHED ACT	PION	Con Form PCT/IDEA/416		
LYON 1001	FOR FURTHER ACT	HON	See Form PCT/IPEA/416		
International application No.	International filing date (a	lay/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)		
PCT/US04/12363 22 April 2004 (22.04.200		4)	23 April 2003 (23.04.2003)		
International Patent Classification (IPC)	or national classification an	d IPC			
IPC(7): H04R 3/00 and US Cl.: 381/96					
Applicant					
RH LYON CORP					
This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.					
2. This REPORT consists of	a total of sheets, i	ncluding this cover s	sheet.		
This report is also accomp	panied by ANNEXES, co	mprising:			
a. (sent to the applica	ant and to the Internation	al Bureau) a total of	sheets, as follows:		
a(sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau) a total of sheets, as follows: sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).					
sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.					
b. (sent to the International Bureau only) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)) , containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in electronic form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).					
4. This report contains indic	ations relating to the follo	owing items:	·		
Box No. I Basis of the report					
	•				
	on-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial				
ar	applicability				
Box No. IV L	ck of unity of invention				
· ——	easoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or dustrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement				
Box No. VI C	ertain documents cited				
Box No. VII C	ertain defects in the international application				
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application					
Date of submission of the demand		Date of completion of this report			
14 April 2005 (14.04.2005)		01 February 2006 (01.02.2006)			
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/ US		Authorized officer			
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents		· Brian T. Pendleton	h while I		
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450		Filan I. Pendicion			
-Facsimile-No-(571)-273-3201		Telephone_No(703))_305-4700		

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (cover sheet)(April 2005)

International application No.	
DCT/IIC04/12263	

Box No. I Basis of the report
1. With regard to the language, this report is based on:
the international application in the language in which it was filed.
a translation of the international application into English, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:
international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4(a))
international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2(a) and/or 55.3(a))
2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this report is based on (replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report):
the international application as originally filed/furnished
the description:
pages 1-63 as originally filed/furnished
pages* NONE received by this Authority on pages* NONE received by this Authority on
the claims:
pages 64-93 as originally filed/furnished pages* NONE as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
pages* NONE received by this Authority on
pages* NONE received by this Authority on
the drawings: pages 1-14 as originally filed/furnished
pages* NONE received by this Authority on pages* NONE received by this Authority on
a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) - see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.
3. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:
the description, pages
the claims, Nos
the drawings, sheets/figs
the sequence listing (specify):
any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify):
4. This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).
the description, pages
the claims, Nos
the drawings, sheets/figs
the sequence listing (specify):
any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify):
* If irem 4 applies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."

International application No. PCT/US04/12363

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement				
1. Statement				
Novelty (N)		Claims	Please See Continuation Sheet	YES
•		Claims	Please See Continuation Sheet	NO
Inventive Step	(IS)	Claims	Please See Continuation Sheet	YES
	` '	Claims	Please See Continuation Sheet	NO
Industrial Appl	icability (IA)	Claims	Please See Continuation Sheet	YES
	Claims	Please See Continuation Sheet	NO	

2. Citations and Explanations (Rule 70.7)
Please See Continuation Sheet

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (Box No. V) (April 2005)

International application No. PCT/US04/12363

	enta	

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

V.1. Reasoned Statements:

The opinion as to Novelty was positive (Yes) with respect to claims 1-74, 76, 78, 83-134, 136, 138, 144 The opinion as to Novelty was negative (No) with respect to claims 75, 77, 79-82, 135, 137, 139-143, 145-149

The opinion as to Inventive Step was positive (Yes) with respect to claims 2-5, 16-20, 43-46, 56-60, 78, 87-89, 93, 94, 98-105, 119-126, 138

The opinion as to Inventive Step was negative(NO) with respect to claims 1, 6-15, 21-42, 47-55, 61-77, 79-86, 90-92, 95-97, 106-118, 127-137, 139-149

The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was positive (YES) with respect to claims 1-149

The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was negative(NO) with respect to claims NONE

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

Claims 1, 6-15, 21, 23-28, 33, 35-42, 47-55, 61-66, 70-74, 86, 90-92, 95-97, 106-113, 116-118, 127-133 and 149 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Ouyang et al, US Patent Application Publication US 2003/0044025 in view of Hobelsberger, US Patent 6,408,078. Ouyang et al disclose a system comprising a plurality (array) of sensors 12, 20; a loudspeaker 40 and a first signal processor 11. Ouyang does not disclose a second signal processor for generating an output signal to the loudspeaker that is proportional to the estimate of the pressure derivative along the sensor axis. Hobelsberger '078 discloses a system for absorbing noise comprising a controller 13 (second signal processor), amplifier 12 and transducer 10. The noise is absorb by utilizing the derivate of the pressure picked up by sensor 8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the references for the purpose of absorbing noise in the Ouyang device, which would improve speech comprehension during a telephone conversation. Independent claims 1, 42, 86, 95, 116, and 149 are met. The dependent claims are met by inherency.

Claims 29-32, 67,68,114,115 and 134 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over the prior art as applied in the immediately preceding paragraph and further in view of Stamegna, US Patent 6,085,078. The combination does not explicitly disclose that it is part of a cellular telephone system which uses RF signals. However, it was well known and obvious that cellular telephones suffer from the background noise problems and voice propagation problems and use directional microphones (as evidenced by Stamegna) therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to embody the combination of Ouyang and Hobelsberger '078 in a cellular phone.

Claims 33 and 69 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over the prior art as applied in the immediately preceding paragraph and further in view of Stonikas et al, US Patent 6,393,130. The combination does not specify a shroud in the apparatus. Stonikas teaches that a shroud is used to reduce feedback between a telephone microphone and speaker. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the combination of Ouyang and Hobelsberger '078 to include a shroud to improve performance.

International application No. PCT/US04/12363

Supplemental Box

Claim 22 is an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over the prior art as applied in the immediately preceding paragraph and further in view of Yang, US Patent 5,914,912. Yang discloses a sonar array post processor which uses a hydrophone for directional beamforming. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a hydrophone in the combination of Ouyang and Hobelsberger for the purpose of producing a directional microphone signal underwater.

Claims 75, 77, 79-82, 135, 137, 139-143, 145-148 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Hobelsberger, US Patent 5,812,686. Hobelsberger discloses a device for simulation of an acoustic impedance comprising acceleration sensor 5, loudspeaker 4 and signal processors 8 and 9.

Claims 85 and 144 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Hobelsberger in view of Yang. Hobelsberger does not disclose that the system is utilized in water. Yang discloses a system which is underwater and uses sonar microphones. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the system of Hobelsberger in water.

Claims 76 and 136 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Hobelsberger '686 in view of Ouyang. Hobelsberger does not disclose an array of pressure sensors. However, it was suggested by Hobelsberger '686 to use the apparatus to eliminate standing waves inside housings. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the apparatus in the Ouyang device for the purpose of decreasing voice signals from the user.

Claim 143 lacks an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over the prior art as applied in the immediately preceding paragraph and further in view of Yang. Yang discloses a sonar array post processor which uses a hydrophone for directional beamforming. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a hydrophone in the combination of Ouyang and Hobelsberger for the purpose of producing a directional microphone signal underwater.

Claims 2-5, 16-20, 43-46, 56-60, 78, 83, 84, 87-89, 93, 94, 98-105, 119-126 and 138 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a third and fourth processor or a comparator coupled to the output of the signal processor that generates the weighted pressure sum signal.